

# Prosody Cloning in Zero-Shot Multispeaker Text-to-Speech

Florian Lux, Julia Koch, Ngoc Thang Vu

Institute for Natural Language Processing (IMS), University of Stuttgart, Germany

florian.lux@ims.uni-stuttgart.de

## Abstract

The cloning of a speaker’s voice using an untranscribed reference sample is one of the great advances of modern neural text-to-speech (TTS) methods. Approaches for mimicking the prosody of a transcribed reference audio have also been proposed recently. In this work, we bring these two tasks together for the first time through utterance level normalization in conjunction with an utterance level speaker embedding. We further introduce a lightweight aligner for extracting fine-grained prosodic features, that can be finetuned on individual samples within seconds. We show that it is possible to clone the voice of a speaker as well as the prosody of a spoken reference independently without any degradation in quality and high similarity to both original voice and prosody, as our objective evaluation and human study show. All of our code and trained models are available, alongside static and interactive demos.

**Index Terms:** speech synthesis, voice masking, prosody cloning, multispeaker, zero-shot

## 1. Introduction

Customizing TTS to speak in different voices with only a short and untranscribed sample is desirable for any spoken human computer interface. While this field remains not completely solved, impressive results were already achieved with early methods in neural end-to-end TTS [1, 2]. Exchanging a voice however also usually leads to a change in speaking style [3]. While adopting the speaking style of a reference is also desirable in some scenarios, there are some cases where we want to be able to customize the voice, but retain a very specific speaking style. One example could be an audio book, where a professional speaker deliberately chooses to speak with a certain prosody. If we would want to exchange the voice, or perhaps turn the audio book into an audio play by assigning each character in an audiobook a unique and customizable voice, we would lose the professional voiceacting that has gone into the original. Another application of such a technology could be the anonymization of a speaker by changing their voice. Since their prosody however also conveys meaning, there would be information loss, if the prosody is not carried over to the new voice.

There is also a fair amount of research on the replication of a speaker’s prosody. This includes methods that operate on a global level to achieve a general style [4, 5]. A special case is the Global Style Tokens (GST) [3]. They use a reference encoder to encode prosody of a reference audio into a fixed-length prosody embedding. While they are able to transfer style of a reference to variable-length target utterances, this method is not suitable for fine-grained prosody modeling.

Similar to GST, [6] also use a prosody encoder, but feed the prosody embedding directly to the decoder instead of through an attention module. This allows for prosody transfer with more fine time detail than in [3]. Encoding prosody in a fixed-length vector however still limits controllability to utterance level.

There are also approaches to cloning prosody on a fine grained level. This is achieved in [7], however only with a single speaker. In [8], explicit prosodic features are extracted from a reference without encoding them into latent vectors, which is similar to our approach. They concatenate extracted values for duration, pitch and energy with encoder outputs and in [9], this technique is used during inference for prosody cloning. Their work differs from ours such that they use an autoregressive model which models prosody less explicitly than our FastSpeech 2 [10] based model that predicts duration, pitch and energy in dedicated submodules. Further, their approach is constrained to speakers it has seen during training. To the best of our knowledge, the cloning of prosody in a zero-shot multispeaker (ZS MS) setting has not been attempted before.

In this work we propose an approach to prosody cloning that works across any voice in a ZS MS setting, as long as a reference audio with matching transcript is available. We extract durations, pitch and energy values for every phone from a reference and then overwrite the respective predictions for these properties that a FastSpeech 2 model makes. A similar control mechanism for human-made adjustments has been proposed in FastPitch [11]. We contribute to this 1) a robust way of extracting those properties with a lightweight aligner that can be adapted to individual samples and 2) a way of normalizing pitch and energy that allows for the overwriting procedure to be compatible with a ZS MS setting by regaining the range of values for each speaker through an utterance level speaker embedding. This enables us to apply any prosody from any reference with matching transcript to any voice. We conduct experiments on the effectiveness of the prosody cloning, its effect on the quality of the resulting synthetic speech, and its impact on ZS MS TTS. Using objective metrics as well as human studies we show that our method is capable of accurately cloning fine prosodic details even in extreme cases without degrading the TTS quality. Furthermore we show that the same prosodic patterns can be applied to any voice, even unseen ones. All of our code and models<sup>1</sup> as well as an interactive demo and a pre-generated demo<sup>2</sup> are available.

## 2. Proposed method

### 2.1. System architecture

Since we want to explicitly control pitch, energy and duration, we choose FastSpeech 2 [12] as the TTS component in our cloning procedure. Since FastSpeech 2 however predicts pitch and energy values on a spectrogram frame scale, we take inspiration from FastPitch [11] and use the average pitch and energy per phone as the output for the pitch and energy predictors. They are then upsampled according to the phone durations in order to be decoded. Furthermore we use the Conformer archi-

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/DigitalPhonetics/IMS-Toucan>

<sup>2</sup><https://toucanprosodycloningdemo.github.io/>

ture [13] in both encoder and decoder. This is congruent with the basic implementation in the IMS Toucan toolkit [14] which is in turn based on the ESPnet toolkit [15, 16]. To condition the TTS on a speaker reference that can be supplied at inference time, we concatenate the output of two different speaker embedding models and add them to the encoder output. One follows the ECAPA-TDNN architecture [17] and the other uses the X-Vector architecture [18]. Both are trained on Voxceleb 1 and 2 [19, 20, 21] using the SpeechBrain toolkit [22]. Inspired by [1], we concatenate the embeddings to the encoder output for the best ZS MS performance. To convert the spectrograms we get from the synthesis into waveforms, we use the HiFi-GAN architecture [23].

## 2.2. Cloning mechanism




Figure 1: *Schematic overview of our proposed cloning procedure. The red lines are overwritten by the green lines. Prosody reference and voice reference can be the same, but they don't need to be. The utterance embedding sets the normalized pitch and energy values into context with regards to the speaker.*

Since we predict durations explicitly and one value for pitch and for energy per phone, we can simply extract those values from a reference audio and overwrite the predictions that the TTS makes. An overview of this process is shown in Figure 1. This comes however with two problems: 1) We need accurate alignment of audio to phones on the reference sample and 2) We need to adapt the scale of those values to the new speaker.

To solve the first issue, we train an aligner as an automatic speech recognition system (ASR) using CTC [24] and a backtranslation loss inspired by [25]. To get alignments from ASR, we sort the posteriors and apply monotonic alignment search [26]. We find that with this lightweight aligner, it is possible to finetune on individual samples in less than a second before attempting to clone them. This improves the accuracy of phone boundaries and thus also of the averaged pitch and energy values significantly over just using a neural aligner trained on different data. And to solve the issue of absolute values for the pitch and energy curves being speaker-dependent, we normalize those values by dividing them with the average of the sequence that they occur in. The resulting curves are no longer speaker dependent. This however introduces the problem of the absolute register of an utterance getting lost. Our solution to this problem lies in the ensemble of speaker embeddings we use, which latently encode the pitch scale. We find that expressive speech and standard speech of the same speaker lead to overlapping, but shifted clusters in the speaker embedding space of the ensemble. So by supplying utterance level speaker embeddings, the normalized representations can automatically be de-normalized for a different speaker.

## 2.3. Training procedure

Because we intend to train our model on multilingual data for greater diversity in prosody, we represent the inputs to our system as articulatory feature vectors to share knowledge of phones between languages with differing phonemesets, which we introduced in [27]. Furthermore we use the LAML procedure to train the TTS, which we introduced in the same work. This means that through a sampling strategy in training with multilinguality in mind, we are able to share as much knowledge of the acoustic model between languages as possible. The aligner is trained on the same data, using a similar procedure to improve its ability to finetune to unseen data rapidly. This results in a very robust phone-recognizer.

## 3. Experimental setup

### 3.1. Resources

The main dataset which we use for all of our evaluations is the ADEPT dataset [9], which has been specifically designed to evaluate prosody cloning in TTS. To train the TTS and the aligner, we use the same datasets. We assume that the greater the diversity in the training data is, the better both the prosody cloning will be able to handle extreme values for pitch, energy and durations and the speaker modelling will be at performing the ZS MS task. Hence we use a multilingual model as the basis and train it on a total of 12 languages. For English, we use the Blizzard Challenge 2011 dataset [28], LJSpeech [29], LibriTTS [30], HiFi-TTS [31] and VCTK [32]. For German we use the HUI-Audio-Corpus-German [33] and the Thorsten corpus [34]. Spanish includes the Blizzard Challenge 2021 dataset [35] and the CSS10 dataset [36], from which we also use the Greek, Finnish, French, Russian, Hungarian and Dutch subsets. The Dutch and French subsets of the Multilingual LibriSpeech [37] are also included, as well as its Polish, Portuguese and Italian subsets. To keep the computational cost manageable, we only use a maximum of 20,000 randomly chosen samples per corpus. This leaves us with a total amount of 400 hours of training data with the highest diversity that we could muster.

### 3.2. Experiments

The ADEPT dataset comes with its own set of benchmark tasks, which we did however not use, since they require vast amounts of human evaluations, for which we lack the capacity. Instead we designed our own experiments in order to verify each of our contributions, inspired partly by [6].

In order to measure whether the cloning of the prosody or the cloning of the voice alone or in conjunction affect the quality of the synthetic audio, we use an ASR system to measure the intelligibility by calculating the Phone Error Rate (PER) that the ASR achieves on synthetic speech produced using different configurations and compare it to the PER on human speech. For the ASR we use the architecture described in [38] and the English recipe from the IMS-speech resource [39].

As suggested in [6], we use Mel Cepstral Distortion (MCD) [40] with Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) [41] and the F<sub>0</sub> Frame Error (FFE) [42] to assess the effectiveness of style cloning when using the same voice. The FFE consists of the Gross Pitch Error (GPE) and the Voicing Decision Error (VDE). Our formula for calculating MCD is defined in Equation 1, where  $x$  and  $y$  are log mel scaled spectrograms,  $DTW$  is an algorithm that compares every timestep  $t_1$  from sequence  $x$  to every timestep  $t_2$  from sequence  $y$  to minimize the sum of results of the  $dist$

function, which denotes euclidean distance between vectors.  $T_x$  denotes the total amount of timesteps in  $x$ .

$$\text{MCD}(x, y) = \frac{\text{DTW}(\sum_t \text{dist}(x_{t1}, y_{t2}))}{T_x} \quad (1)$$

We calculate FFE according to Equation 2 and it consists of the set of VDEs defined in Equation 3 and the set of GPEs defined in Equation 4.  $x$  and  $y$  are pitch contours with unvoiced segments referring to 0 and  $T_x$  denotes the total amount of timesteps in  $x$ . Individual timesteps are denoted as  $t$ .

$$\text{FFE}(x, y) = \frac{||\text{VDE}(x, y) \cup \text{GPE}(x, y)||}{T_x} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{VDE}(x, y) = \{t \text{ where } (x_t = 0) \neq (y_t = 0)\} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{GPE}(x, y) = \{t \text{ where } \neg(x_t \cdot 0.8 \leq y_t \leq x_t \cdot 1.2)\} \quad (4)$$

To evaluate the perceptive qualities of the cloning procedure in conjunction with the voice cloning, we conduct an on-line study where raters are asked to indicate how similar a synthetic sample sounds compared to a human reference sample on a scale of 1 to 5. Raters were asked to only take the prosody of the samples into account and ignore the voice of the speaker. The samples for this study were chosen from the Marked Tonicity subset of the ADEPT corpus. All synthetic samples in the study are produced in voices that have not been seen during training and are adapted to in a ZS MS fashion. We measure the impact of two different factors by evaluating three types of synthetic samples. For the first category of samples, the voice of the speaker is cloned, but the prosody is left unconditional. For the second category, the voice is cloned and additionally the prosody is cloned. This should give us an indication of how much of a difference the prosody cloning makes perceptually. And the third category clones the prosody, but uses a different voice than the prosody reference. The difference between the second and third category shows whether the speaker embedding and the prosodic parameters are disentangled or whether the normalization of the prosodic parameters followed by the implicit de-normalization using the speaker embedding fails.

While the previous experiment measures the effectiveness of exchanging the prosody regardless of the voice, the final experiment measures the effectiveness of exchanging the voice regardless of the prosody used. For this we measure the speaker similarity across multiple samples spoken by unseen speakers with and without prosody cloning. A difference in absolute speaker similarity that is smaller than the standard deviation would indicate that the prosody cloning has no significant impact on the voice cloning.

## 4. Results and discussions

### 4.1. Quantitative results

#### 4.1.1. Degradation of speech quality

The results of our objective evaluation of intelligibility are shown in Table 1. The voice used for the speaker or whether the prosody is cloned or not only have a marginal impact on the resulting PER. Overall, the synthetic systems perform almost on par with the human speech in terms of intelligibility and the highest pairwise difference between the synthetic types is 0.03 PER, which is negligible.

Table 1: *Phone-Error-Rate of an ASR system on the ADEPT corpus for human speech and different synthetic speech configurations, which have not seen the speakers or texts during training.*

Speech Type	PER
Human Reference	12.6%
TTS - same voice, uncloned prosody	12.7%
TTS - same voice, cloned prosody	12.7%
TTS - different voice, cloned prosody	12.7%

#### 4.1.2. Objective prosodic similarity

Table 2 shows that the cloned style is significantly closer to the reference than a sample that is conditioned on an utterance embedding globally both in terms of MCD and FFE. While the FFE still seems fairly high, this is to a large extent due to the pitch tracking we use (Dio with Stonemask refinement [43]) making many mistakes and having many outliers on the highly expressive speech in the ADEPT corpus.

Table 2: *Mel Cepstral Distortion and  $F_0$  Frame Error for comparing the prosody of a TTS conditioned globally on the speaker and a TTS that additionally clones the prosody to expressive human references. Displayed is the average score of all samples of the ADEPT dataset. The voice of the human speaker was cloned in all cases, since we are dealing with absolute pitch values, which are speaker dependent.*

Speech Type	MCD	FFE
same voice - uncloned prosody	25.63	48.43%
same voice - cloned prosody	5.59	37.02%

#### 4.1.3. Human perception

Table 3 shows the average similarity rating of 32 participants, who each rated 10 samples per category. So a total of 320 ratings per category are summarized to one score. A slight degradation is expected when the utterance embedding is exchanged, since the range of prosodic values no longer matches the reference. The impact is however very small compared to the massive difference to the similarity that a globally conditioned sample achieves. Furthermore, the standard deviation indicates a major overlap in ratings for the models with cloned prosody, but only a very minor overlap with the model that does not clone the utterance on a phone level.

Table 3: *Human rating of similarity between human and synthetic speech on a scale from 1 (dissimilar) to 5 (exact match). Raters were asked to only take the prosody into account and ignore any deviation in voice.*

Model	Similarity	$\sigma$
same voice, cloned prosody	4.13	$\pm 0.95$
different voice, cloned prosody	3.93	$\pm 1.08$
same voice, uncloned prosody	2.09	$\pm 1.09$

#### 4.1.4. Impact on voice cloning

In Table 4 we show the average cosine similarities of speaker embeddings extracted from human references compared to dif-

ferent configurations of synthetic speech. The speaker embeddings that are being compared are extracted with the same method that we use to get speaker embeddings as conditioning signal, i.e. an ensemble of two state-of-the-art speaker identification models. The average similarity of the synthetic speech with cloned prosody is marginally higher for both the male and the female speaker from the ADEPT dataset. This is possibly the case, because the speech that the scores were calculated from is very expressive and usually has a high pitch range, which is a factor that impacts the speaker embedding. The low standard deviation indicates a concise distribution of values. Compared to intra-human speaker similarity all synthetic speech configurations perform sufficient in the ZS MS voice cloning task, regardless of cloning the prosody.

Table 4: Similarity of all samples from the ADEPT corpus spoken by the two speakers of the ADEPT corpus with and without prosody cloning. Synthetic speech is compared to the human reference, speaker identity of the human reference is always cloned. The human samples in the ADEPT corpus compared to each other reach a similarity of 0.89 for the male speaker and 0.87 for the female speaker, showing the upper bound.

Speaker	Cloned	Cosine Similarity	$\sigma$
male	yes	0.842	$\pm 0.030$
male	no	0.835	$\pm 0.032$
female	yes	0.819	$\pm 0.029$
female	no	0.813	$\pm 0.022$

#### 4.2. Qualitative results

Figure 2 shows an instance of samples which are used for measuring the objective prosodic similarity and the human perception of prosodic similarity. While the pitch contour clearly is not an exact match to the human reference, the general trends are accurately mimicked. Furthermore the absolute value range is accurate except for the peak directly after the first pause, which is sharper in the human speech. So despite the normalization of the pitch curves removing the information about the absolute value range, the utterance level speaker embedding seems to be sufficient to reconstruct it. We refer readers to our static and interactive demos linked at the beginning of the paper to explore the perceptive performance themselves.




Figure 2: Spectrogram excerpts of the same sentence uttered in an expressive way by a human, the TTS cloning the human and the TTS without cloning. The pitch curve is displayed in red. The voice reference of the synthetic samples is the same as the (unseen) human speaker.

To analyze the voice cloning further, we visualize all of the samples in the expressive ADEPT corpus spoken with ZS MS

voice adaptation by both speakers in the corpus with and without cloning the prosody in Figure 3. Since the projection into the 2D space for visualization is done with t-SNE and there are not many distinctive features in the data, the clusters in the visualization look quite fuzzy. However there is a very clear distinction between the two speakers and essentially no distinction between the versions with and without prosody cloning, which is congruent with the results we get in Table 4.




Figure 3: Speaker embedding visualization of the two speakers of the ADEPT dataset with and without cloning. Both cloned and unconditional speech for every sample from the corpus is included, even the samples of the opposite speaker. The presence or absence of the prosody cloning has no impact on the voice of the synthetic samples, which is congruent with our own perception. The speakers are completely unseen.

## 5. Ethical considerations

While technology that allows the cloning of voices and speaking styles has been around for a while [1, 3, 6], the method of extracting and overwriting conditioning signals in a TTS that we propose allows for more nuanced control over the cloned speech, disentangling the speaker from the prosody. While this holds the potential to be misused to impersonate others with more control over how the impersonation sounds, we believe that the applications with a positive impact outweigh this fact. For example the masking of a voice to keep the speaker private, but retain their exact prosody, which is an unsolved trade-off in current voice sanitation methods [44]. Another example is the use of this technology for research purposes, since this allows us to unify the voices of multiple interpretations of the same text to allow for literary studies on the impact of the prosody alone. Furthermore, we plan on experimenting with inaudible audio-watermarking that is encoded into the weights of a TTS as well as deepfake detection models to ensure that synthetic samples can always be easily identified as such.

## 6. Conclusions

We show an approach for cloning the prosody of a reference audio in terms of duration, pitch and energy on a phone level while being able to vary the voice of the TTS in a zero-shot manner. Objective evaluation shows that 1) there is no degradation in quality, 2) the performance of voice cloning is not impacted by prosody cloning and 3) the prosody cloning per phone achieves greatly increased similarity to an expressive human reference than a globally conditioned sample. Human evaluation further shows that the quality of the prosody cloning is high and not significantly impacted by the voice cloning.

## 7. References

- [1] Y. Jia, Y. Zhang, R. Weiss, Q. Wang, J. Shen *et al.*, “Transfer learning from speaker verification to multispeaker text-to-speech

- synthesis,” in *NeurIPS*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [2] S. Arik, J. Chen, K. Peng, W. Ping, and Y. Zhou, “Neural voice cloning with a few samples,” *NeurIPS*, vol. 31, 2018.
  - [3] Y. Wang, D. Stanton, Y. Zhang, R.-S. Ryan, E. Battenberg *et al.*, “Style tokens: Unsupervised style modeling, control and transfer in end-to-end speech synthesis,” in *ICML*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 5180–5189.
  - [4] S. Shechtman and A. Sorin, “Sequence to Sequence Neural Speech Synthesis with Prosody Modification Capabilities,” in *Proc. 10th ISCA Speech Synthesis Workshop*, 2019.
  - [5] T. Raitio, R. Rasipuram, and D. Castellani, “Controllable Neural Text-to-Speech Synthesis Using Intuitive Prosodic Features,” in *Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 4432–4436.
  - [6] R. Skerry-Ryan, E. Battenberg, Y. Xiao, Y. Wang, D. Stanton *et al.*, “Towards end-to-end prosody transfer for expressive speech synthesis with tacotron,” in *ICML*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 4693–4702.
  - [7] V. Klimkov, S. Ronanki, J. Rohnke, and T. Drugman, “Fine-Grained Robust Prosody Transfer for Single-Speaker Neural Text-To-Speech,” in *Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 4440–4444.
  - [8] D. S. R. Mohan, V. Hu, T. H. Teh, A. Torresquintero, C. G. Wallis *et al.*, “Ctrl-P: Temporal Control of Prosodic Variation for Speech Synthesis,” in *Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 3875–3879.
  - [9] A. Torresquintero, T. H. Teh, C. G. Wallis, M. Staib, D. S. R. Mohan *et al.*, “ADEPT: A Dataset for Evaluating Prosody Transfer,” in *Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 3880–3884.
  - [10] Y. Ren, Y. Ruan, X. Tan, T. Qin, S. Zhao *et al.*, “FastSpeech: fast, robust and controllable text to speech,” in *NeurIPS*, 2019.
  - [11] A. Łańcucki, “FastPitch: Parallel text-to-speech with pitch prediction,” in *ICASSP*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 6588–6592.
  - [12] Y. Ren, C. Hu, X. Tan, T. Qin, S. Zhao *et al.*, “FastSpeech 2: Fast and High-Quality End-to-End Text to Speech,” in *ICLR*, 2020.
  - [13] A. Gulati, J. Qin, C.-C. Chiu, N. Parmar, Y. Zhang *et al.*, “Conformer: Convolution-augmented Transformer for Speech Recognition,” *Interspeech*, pp. 5036–5040, 2020.
  - [14] F. Lux, J. Koch, A. Schweitzer, and N. T. Vu, “The IMS Toucan system for the Blizzard Challenge 2021,” in *Proc. Blizzard Challenge Workshop*, vol. 2021. Speech Synthesis SIG, 2021.
  - [15] T. Hayashi, R. Yamamoto, K. Inoue, T. Yoshimura, S. Watanabe *et al.*, “ESPnet-TTS: Unified, reproducible, and integratable open source end-to-end text-to-speech toolkit,” in *ICASSP*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 7654–7658.
  - [16] T. Hayashi, R. Yamamoto, T. Yoshimura, P. Wu, J. Shi *et al.*, “ESPnet2-TTS: Extending the Edge of TTS Research,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07840*, 2021.
  - [17] B. Desplanques, J. Thienpondt, and K. Demuynck, “ECAPA-TDNN: emphasized channel attention, propagation and aggregation in TDNN based speaker verification,” in *Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 3830–3834.
  - [18] D. Snyder, D. Garcia-Romero, A. McCree, G. Sell, D. Povey *et al.*, “Spoken language recognition using x-vectors,” *Odyssey 2018*, pp. 105–111, 2018.
  - [19] A. Nagrani, J. S. Chung, W. Xie, and A. Zisserman, “Voxceleb: Large-scale speaker verification in the wild,” *Computer Science and Language*, 2019.
  - [20] A. Nagrani, J. S. Chung, and A. Zisserman, “Voxceleb: a large-scale speaker identification dataset,” in *Interspeech*, 2017, pp. 2616–2620.
  - [21] J. S. Chung, A. Nagrani, and A. Zisserman, “Voxceleb2: Deep speaker recognition,” in *Interspeech*, 2018, pp. 1086–1090.
  - [22] M. Ravanelli, T. Parcollet, P. Plantinga, A. Rouhe, S. Cornell *et al.*, “SpeechBrain: A general-purpose speech toolkit,” 2021.
  - [23] J. Kong, J. Kim, and J. Bae, “HiFi-GAN: Generative adversarial networks for efficient and high fidelity speech synthesis,” *NeurIPS*, vol. 33, 2020.
  - [24] A. Graves, S. Fernández, F. Gomez, and J. Schmidhuber, “Connectionist temporal classification: labelling unsegmented sequence data with recurrent neural networks,” in *ICML*, 2006, pp. 369–376.
  - [25] A. Pérez-González-de Martos, A. Sanchis, and A. Juan, “VRain-UPV MLLP’s system for the Blizzard Challenge 2021,” *Proc. Blizzard Challenge Workshop*, 2021.
  - [26] J. Kim, S. Kim, J. Kong, and S. Yoon, “Glow-tts: A generative flow for text-to-speech via monotonic alignment search,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 8067–8077, 2020.
  - [27] F. Lux and N. T. Vu, “Language-Agnostic Meta-Learning for Low-Resource Text-to-Speech with Articulatory Features,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.03191 accepted at ACL*, 2022.
  - [28] S. King and V. Karaiskos, “The Blizzard Challenge 2011,” in *Proc. Blizzard Challenge Workshop*, vol. 2011, 2011.
  - [29] K. Ito and L. Johnson, “The LJ Speech Dataset,” <https://keithito.com/LJ-Speech-Dataset/>, 2017.
  - [30] H. Zen, V. Dang, R. Clark, Y. Zhang, R. J. Weiss *et al.*, “LibriTTS: A Corpus Derived from LibriSpeech for Text-to-Speech,” in *Interspeech*, 2019, pp. 1526–1530.
  - [31] E. Bakhturina, V. Lavrukhin, B. Ginsburg, and Y. Zhang, “Hi-Fi Multi-Speaker English TTS Dataset,” in *Interspeech*, 2021, pp. 2776–2780.
  - [32] C. Veaux, J. Yamagishi, K. MacDonald *et al.*, “Superseded-CSTR VCTK corpus: English multi-speaker corpus for CSTR voice cloning toolkit,” 2017.
  - [33] P. Puchtler, J. Wirth, and R. Peinl, “Hui-audio-corpus-german: A high quality tts dataset,” in *German Conference on Artificial Intelligence (Künstliche Intelligenz)*. Springer, 2021, pp. 204–216.
  - [34] T. Müller and D. Kreutz, “Thorsten - open german voice (neutral) dataset,” <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5525342>, 2021.
  - [35] Z.-H. Ling, X. Zhou, and S. King, “The blizzard challenge 2021,” in *Proc. Blizzard Challenge Workshop*, 2021.
  - [36] K. Park and T. Mulc, “CSS10: A Collection of Single Speaker Speech Datasets for 10 Languages,” *Interspeech*, pp. 1566–1570, 2019.
  - [37] V. Pratap, Q. Xu, A. Sriram, G. Synnaeve, and R. Collobert, “MLS: A Large-Scale Multilingual Dataset for Speech Research,” in *Interspeech*, 2020, pp. 2757–2761.
  - [38] S. Karita, N. Chen, T. Hayashi, T. Hori, H. Inaguma *et al.*, “A comparative study on transformer vs rnn in speech applications,” in *ASRU*, 2019.
  - [39] P. Denisov and N. T. Vu, “IMS-speech: A speech to text tool,” *Studientexte zur Sprachkommunikation: Elektronische Sprachsignalverarbeitung 2019*, pp. 170–177, 2019.
  - [40] R. Kubichek, “Mel-cepstral distance measure for objective speech quality assessment,” in *PacRim*, vol. 1. IEEE, 1993, pp. 125–128.
  - [41] D. J. Berndt and J. Clifford, “Using dynamic time warping to find patterns in time series,” in *KDD workshop*, vol. 10, no. 16. Seattle, WA, USA:, 1994, pp. 359–370.
  - [42] T. Nakatani, S. Amano, T. Irino, K. Ishizuka, and T. Kondo, “A method for fundamental frequency estimation and voicing decision: Application to infant utterances recorded in real acoustical environments,” *Speech Communication*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 203–214, 2008.
  - [43] M. Morise, H. Kawahara, and T. Nishiura, “Rapid f0 estimation for high-snr speech based on fundamental component extraction,” *Trans. IEICEJ*, vol. 93, 2010.
  - [44] N. Tomashenko, X. Wang, E. Vincent, J. Patino, B. M. L. Srivastava *et al.*, “The voiceprivacy 2020 challenge: Results and findings,” *Computer Speech & Language*, 2022.